

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 2 and 4 through 19 remain in this application in which claims 10 through 19 are withdrawn.

Claims 1, 2 and 4 through 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,816,713 to Chen ("Chen patent"). The above Office Action states that "... a portion of the release arm must deform in order for the latch to release, so the deformation is inherently taught."

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection of the claims. Independent claim 1 provides, *inter alia*, a latch comprising a thumb release coupled to the clasp arm, in which the clasp arm deforms in response to receiving a force at the thumb release, thereby decoupling the clasp from the electronic device.

In contrast, the Chen patent discloses a holding arm 35 that may be withdrawn (a limited distance) from an opening 241 of a retaining mount 20. When a button 31 is pressed down, its abutment wing 312 moves against a link bar 33 so that the retaining flange 333 pivots out of engagement with a gear set 34, which is also engaged with the rack teeth 353 of the holding arm 35. As a result, the holding arm 35 withdraws from the retaining mount 20 by the force of a spring 355. It is important to note that the holding arm 35 does not deform in response to receiving a force at the button 31 for two reasons. First, the holding is engaged with the gear set 34 and the spring 355, and is not directly engaged with the button 31. Second, the abutment wing 312 of the button 31 is beveled so that, when it is pressed down upon the link bar (at the

side opposite the spring 32), the link bar 33 pivots to compress the spring 32 and disengage the retaining flange 33 from the gear set 34. No portion of the mechanism deforms in order to release the holding arm 35. Therefore, claim 1 distinguishes patentably from the Chen patent.

Claims 2 and 4 through 9 depend from and include all limitations of independent claim 1. Therefore, claims 2 and 4 through 9 distinguish patentably from the Chen patent for the reasons stated above for claim 1.

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2 and 4 through 9 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. Also, no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to deduct any additional fees arising as a result of this response, including any fees for Extensions of Time, or any other communication from or to credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2117.

It is submitted that the claims clearly define the invention, are supported by the specification and drawings, and are in a condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Should the Examiner have any

questions or concerns that may expedite prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
Phelps, William C., et al.

Please forward all correspondence to:
Motorola, Inc.
Law Department (HDW)
600 North US Highway 45
Libertyville, IL 60048

<u>/HISASHI D. WATANABE/</u>	<u>01/23/2007</u>
Hisashi D. Watanabe	Date
Attorney for Applicant(s)	
Registration No. 37,465	
Telephone: (847) 523-2322	
Facsimile: (847) 523-2350	